



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

It is clear, then, that the labor before the next editor of the Peshitta will be very great, but the gain should be worth all the labor which can be bestowed. Barnes, on the basis of his own collations, came to the conclusion "that when all is done, when the best MSS have been used to the full, many readings will remain which will bear the appearance of corruptions of the original. We shall not obtain a perfect Peshitta, but we shall obtain one in which all the books will reach the high level obtained by the Psalter in \mathbb{S}^u ."¹ But what we need is a text of the Peshitta restored as closely as possible to that which the Syrian church read in the fifth century or earlier, a text fit to take its place beside the best critical editions of the Hebrew original and its Greek version.

JOSHUA BLOCH

NEW YORK CITY

IVORY AND APES OF OPHIR

In *AJSL*, XXXVI, 103-19, Clark has placed biblical scholars in his debt by laying the ghost of an East Indian Ophir which still haunts our handbooks. Owing to a pardonable lack of acquaintance with the Egyptian material, however, he has arrived at wholly negative results where positive are attainable. I Kings 10:22, וְהָיָה וְהָיָה וְהָיָה וְהָיָה should be rendered: "ivory, *gp*-monkeys and *kyy*-monkeys." שְׁנֵהָבִים is literally "tooth of elephants," Eg. $\mathfrak{z}bw$, and is identical in formation with the Assyrian compound *šinni-pīri*, "ivory," pronounced approximately *sinnipīr*, possibly the etymon of the puzzling סְנַפִּיר, supposed to mean "fin," but perhaps "tusk." The form תְּכִיִּים instead of כִּיִּים* (*kyy* occurs with *gp* in Egyptian texts) is, if the ת is not merely dittography, perhaps on a par with Ar. *timsāḥ*, "crocodile," from Coptic *emsāḥ*. The feminine article *t* with a masculine noun points to a loan from a very corrupt border jargon. Assyr. *namsuḥu* = *nemsōḥ* is a correct form with the plural article.

There can be little doubt that Ophir corresponds roughly to the African coast between Port Sūdān and Berbera in the Somaliland, Eg. Pwnt, which I have identified with Sumerian Meluḡa (see *JEA*, VI, 90-92).² The gold of Ophir presumably came from the auriferous region between the latitude of Esneh and Abyssinia (Reissner, *JEA*, VI, 79). The Rhodesian mirage has long since been dissipated, and the same is now true of Glaser's identification of Ophir with Hüsing's Hapirti, now known to read Hatamti = Adamdun in western Elam (Scheil, *DEP*, X, 2 f.). The Egyptian appearance of the word אוֹפִיר (cf. *Ūstr*, *Ostr*) points to a passage of the word through Egyptian mouths; the hieroglyphic form would be * $\mathfrak{z}prw$. The tree-name

¹ *Expos. Times*, IX (September, 1898), 562.

² It is quite unnecessary to include the peninsula of Sinai under the term Meluḡa, since malachite abounds in the Nubian desert, as I am informed by a mining engineer now working (June, 1920) in that region.

almug, or better *algum* (אלגום and אלגים point to an original אלגם) cannot be Assyr. *elammaku*, but may represent, I would suggest, the *Acacia arabica*, from which gum arabic is obtained, and which ranges from Esneh to Abyssinia (Muschler, *Manual Flora of Egypt*, 1,460). It may be noted that κόμμι, "gum," is a loan from some foreign language, perhaps from Arabic (cf. Ar. *gamma*, "collect, of liquid"), so *algum* may be an Arabic word meaning "the gum."

While endorsing the conclusions of the article mentioned above, one cannot but regret a certain *Spitzfindigkeit*, characteristic also of *AJSL*, XXXIII, 261-82. Most of the conclusions of the latter article may now be rejected, the occurrence of Indo-Iranian elements among the Hittites and Mitanni being triumphantly vindicated by the discovery of a whole series of borrowed Indo-Iranian numerals in the tablets from Boghaz-keui.

W. F. ALBRIGHT

AMERICAN SCHOOL OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH
JERUSALEM

THE PRINCIPLE OF DIFFERENTIATION BETWEEN "THE WORD OF THE LORD" AND "THE ANGEL OF THE LORD"

Of the phrases in use in the Old Testament to describe the medium of revelation, two of the commonest are "the word of the Lord" and "the angel of the Lord," and their synonymous character is no longer obscured by immature conceptions of revelation. The difference between science and romance in biblical exegesis has at length been formally recognized in all circles of Bible study where any degree of competency may be claimed. There is henceforth no danger of a return or a relapse to that primitive conception of angels in which the imaginative elements are definitely identified with the spiritual reality underlying the description; and though the "word of the Lord" under the hypostasizing tendencies of Jewish Hellenism meant more than a mere technicality of revelation, it is clear that its original use was free from the peculiar philosophy of emanations (*dunameis*) with which it was so closely associated in the course of a developing theology. In reading such a passage as Gen. 15:1, "the word of the Lord came to Abram in a vision," or Gen. 16:7, "the angel of the Lord found her by a fountain of water," the synonymy of these two expressions is patent, inasmuch as they are two different ways of saying the same thing, namely, that something was revealed by God to Abram and Hagar respectively. Clearly, then, they are to be interpreted exegetically as technicalities of revelation.

But no less clearly as they are identical in regard to their fundamental significance do they differentiate the specific manner of the revelation itself; that is to say, the respective phrases indicate a difference in the origin or